

# ON CONSTRUCTIONS OF SOME CLASSES OF QUASI-HEREDITARY ALGEBRAS

Piroska Lakatos

Institute of Mathematics and Informatics,  
Lajos Kossuth University  
P.O.Box 12, 4010 Debrecen, Hungary

**ABSTRACT.** Inspired by the work of Mirollo and Vilonen [MV] describing the categories of perverse sheaves as module categories over certain finite dimensional algebras, Dlab and Ringel introduced [DR2] an explicit recursive construction of these algebras in terms of the algebras  $A(\gamma)$ . In particular, they characterized the quasi-hereditary algebras of Cline-Parshall-Scott [PS] and constructed them in this way. The present paper provides a characterization of lean algebras and some other special classes of algebras in terms of this recursive process.

## 1. Basics and Notation

The aim of this paper is to clarify the structure of particular types of quasi-hereditary algebras which appear in the applications to the theory of Lie algebras. Our method is based on the construction described in [DR2], taking into account some characteristic properties of the bimodules and maps which define the recursive process to build up quasi-hereditary algebras of certain type.

Let  $A$  be a basic finite dimensional  $K$ -algebra and  $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_A = (e_1, e_2, e_3, \dots, e_n)$  a complete sequence of primitive orthogonal idempotents of the algebra  $A$  so that  $\sum_{i=1}^n e_i = 1 : A_A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n e_i A$ . Write  $\varepsilon_i = e_i + e_{i+1} + \dots + e_n$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $\varepsilon_{n+1} = 0$ . Let us recall the definition of the right and left standard modules of  $A$ :  $\Delta(i) = \Delta_A(i) = e_i A / e_i A \varepsilon_{i+1} A$  and  $\Delta^o(i) = \Delta_A^o(i) = A e_i / A \varepsilon_{i+1} A e_i$ ,

---

Research partially supported by Hungarian NFSR grant No. TO16432.

respectively. A standard module is said to be Schurian if its endomorphism algebra is a division algebra. In general, write  $d_i = \dim_K \text{End } S(i)$ . In what follows,  $S(i)$  denote the simple right  $A$ -modules,  $P(i) \simeq e_i A$  their projective covers and  $V(i)$  the kernels of the canonical epimorphisms  $P(i) \rightarrow \Delta(i)$  (see [D1] for the basic definitions and notation). Thus, for every  $1 \leq i \leq n$  we have short exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow V(i) \rightarrow P(i) \rightarrow \Delta(i) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \rightarrow U(i) \rightarrow \Delta(i) \rightarrow S(i) \rightarrow 0.$$

Of course, for the left modules there are similar canonical short exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow V^o(i) \rightarrow P^o(i) \rightarrow \Delta^o(i) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \rightarrow U^o(i) \rightarrow \Delta^o(i) \rightarrow S^o(i) \rightarrow 0.$$

Given a (right)  $A$ -module  $X$ , define its *trace filtration* (with respect to  $\mathbf{e}$ ) by

$$X = X^{(1)} \supseteq X^{(2)} \supseteq \dots \supseteq X^{(i)} \supseteq X^{(i+1)} \supseteq \dots \supseteq X^{(n)} \supseteq X^{(n+1)} = 0,$$

where  $X^{(i)}$  is the submodule of  $X$  generated by the homomorphic images of the module  $\varepsilon_i A$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Considering the trace filtration of the algebra  $A$

$$A = A\varepsilon_1 A \supseteq A\varepsilon_1 A \supseteq \dots \supseteq A\varepsilon_i A \supseteq \dots \supseteq A\varepsilon_n A \supseteq A\varepsilon_{n+1} A = 0,$$

we obtain its filtration by the idempotent ideals  $A^{(i)} = A\varepsilon_i A$ .

An algebra  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is said to be *quasi-hereditary* if, for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , the modules  $\Delta(i)$  are Schurian and  $(A\varepsilon_i A)/(A\varepsilon_{i+1} A) \simeq \oplus \Delta(i)$  (cf. the original definition of Cline-Parshall-Scott; see also [DR1]).

Equivalently, the algebra  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is quasi-hereditary if

$$\dim_K A = \sum_{i=1}^n (1/d_i) \dim_K \Delta(i) \dim_K \Delta^o(i), \quad (1)$$

The equality (1) is equivalent to the fact that  $\text{End } \Delta(i) \simeq \text{End } S(i)$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and the regular representation  $A_A$  has a  $\Delta$ -filtration i.e there is a chain of submodules

$$A_A = X^{(0)} \supset \dots \supset X^{(t)} \supset X^{(t+1)} \supset \dots \supset X^{(l-1)} \supset X^{(l)} = 0$$

such that  $X^{(t)}/X^{(t+1)} = \Delta(i_t)$  for all  $0 \leq t \leq l-1$ . Indeed, using an induction argument, this follows from the following statements (A) – (C) (cf. [D2])

(A) For every (right)  $A$ -module  $X$ ,  $[X : S(i)] = (1/d_i) \dim_K X e_i$ ; thus

$$[A_A : S(n)] = (1/d_n) \dim_K A e_n = (1/d_n) \dim_K \Delta^o(n).$$

(B) Always,  $\dim_K A e_n A \leq (1/d_n) \dim_K \Delta(n) \dim_K \Delta^o(n)$ .

(C) The equality  $\dim_K A e_n A = (1/d_n) \dim_K \Delta(n) \dim_K \Delta^o(n)$  holds

if and only if  $\text{End}_A \Delta(n) = \text{End}_A S(n)$  and  $A e_n A \simeq \bigoplus_{\text{finite}} \Delta(n)$ .

## 2. The construction of $A(\gamma)$

Recall the (recursive) construction of quasi-hereditary algebra introduced in [DR2]. We shall modify it to describe a construction of particular classes of quasi-hereditary algebras.

Let  $D$  be a division  $K$ -algebra,  $C$  a basic  $K$ -algebra,  ${}_D S_C$  and  ${}_C T_D$  finite-dimensional bimodules with  $K$  acting centrally. Let  $\gamma : {}_C T_D \otimes_D S_C \rightarrow {}_C C_C$  be a bimodule homomorphism whose image lies in  $\text{rad } C$ . Let

$$B = D \ltimes ({}_D S_C \otimes_C T_D)$$

the "split"  $K$ -algebra with the coordinate-wise addition and multiplication given by

$$(d_1, s_1 \otimes t_1)(d_2, s_2 \otimes t_2) = (d_1 d_2, d_1 s_2 \otimes t_2 + s_1 \otimes t_1 d_2 + s_1 \gamma(t_1 \otimes s_2) \otimes t_2).$$

Clearly,  $B$  is a local  $K$ -algebra with  $\text{rad } B = S_C \otimes_C T$ . It follows that  $S$  has the structure of a  $B$ - $C$ -bimodule by  $(d, s \otimes t) \cdot s' = d s' + s \gamma(t \otimes s')$  and  $T$  the structure of a  $C$ - $B$ -bimodule by  $t' \cdot (d, s \otimes t) = t' d + \gamma(t' \otimes s) t$ . In [DR2], the  $2 \times 2$  matrix  $A = \begin{pmatrix} B & S \\ T & C \end{pmatrix}$  with multiplication given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} b & s \\ t & c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b' & s' \\ t' & c' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} b b' + (0, s \otimes t') & b \cdot s' + s c' \\ t \cdot b' + c t' & \gamma(t \otimes s') + c c' \end{pmatrix}$$

is shown to be a  $A(\gamma)$  ring, viz. the quotient of the tensor algebra over the  $(C \times D)$ - $(C \times D)$ -bimodule  $T \oplus S$  by the ideal

$$I(\gamma) = \langle t \otimes s - \gamma(t \otimes s) \mid t \in T, s \in S \rangle.$$

Note that  $e_1 = \begin{pmatrix} (1,0) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\mathbf{e}_C = (e_2, e_3, \dots, e_n)$  is a complete sequence of primitive orthogonal idempotents of  $C$ . Dlab and Ringel have shown in [DR2] that  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is quasi-hereditary if and only if  $(C, \mathbf{e}_C)$  is quasi-hereditary and  $S_C$  and  ${}_C T$  have  $\Delta_C$ -filtration and  $\Delta_C^\circ$ -filtration, respectively; in fact, they have shown that all basic quasi-hereditary algebras over a perfect field  $K$  can be obtained by iterating this construction, starting with a division  $K$ -algebra  $C$ . Here, we are going to characterize lean algebras, as well as some special classes of quasi-hereditary algebras  $A$  in terms of properties of  $C$ ,  ${}_D S_C$ ,  ${}_C T_D$  and the homomorphism  $\gamma$ .

Consider a quasi-hereditary algebra  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  and the centralizer (quasi-hereditary) algebra  $(C, e_C)$ , where  $C = \varepsilon_2 A \varepsilon_2$ , together with the  $C$ -modules  $S_C = e_1 A \varepsilon_2$ , and  ${}_C T = \varepsilon_2 A e_1$ . There is a close relationship between  $A$  and  $C$  given by the following pair of functors:

$$\Phi : \text{mod } -A \rightarrow \text{mod } -C \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi : \text{mod } -C \rightarrow \text{mod } -A$$

defined by  $\Phi(X_A) = X \varepsilon_2$  and  $\Psi(Y_C) = Y \otimes_C \varepsilon_2 A$ . Recall that, for a  $\Delta$ -filtered  $A$ -module  $X$ , the multiplication map

$$X \varepsilon_2 \otimes_C \varepsilon_2 A \longrightarrow X \varepsilon_2 A \quad \text{is bijective (see [D1]).}$$

It follows that, for  $i \geq 2$ ,  $V_A(i) \varepsilon_2 = V_C(i)$  and  $V_C(i) \varepsilon_2 \otimes_C \varepsilon_2 A = V_A(i)$ ,  $P_A(i) \varepsilon_2 = P_C(i)$ ,  $P_C(i) \otimes_C \varepsilon_2 A = P_A(i)$ ,  $\Delta_A(i) \varepsilon_2 = \Delta_C(i)$ , and  $\Delta_A(i)$  is a quotient of  $\Delta_C(i) \otimes_C \varepsilon_2 A$ . In particular,  $V(i)$  is a projective  $A$ -module if and only if  $V(i) \varepsilon_2$  is a projective  $C$ -module. Furthermore, since  $\varepsilon_2 A = {}_C (T \oplus C)_A$ ,  $V_A(1) = S_C \otimes ({}_C T \oplus C)_A$  is a projective  $A$ -module if and only if  $S_C$  is a projective  $C$ -module.

Let us remark that all precedings statements apply also to the left  $C$ -modules  $V_C^\circ(i)$ ,  $P_C^\circ(i)$ ,  $\Delta_C^\circ(i)$  and the left  $A$ -modules  $V_A^\circ(i)$ ,  $P_A^\circ(i)$ ,  $\Delta_A^\circ(i)$ .

### 3. Lean Algebras

An algebra  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is said to be *lean* with respect to the order  $\mathbf{e}$  (see [ADL] or [D1]) if

$$e_i(\text{rad } A)^2 e_j = e_i(\text{rad } A) \varepsilon_m(\text{rad } A) e_j \text{ for all } 1 \leq i, j \leq n, m = \min\{i, j\}. \quad (2)$$

Equivalently,  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is lean if the standard modules are Schurian and, for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , both  $V(i)$  and  $V^o(i)$  are top submodules of  $\text{rad } P(i)$  and  $\text{rad } P^o(i)$  respectively (see [ADL]). Recall that a submodule  $X$  is a *top submodule* of  $Y$  if  $\text{rad } X = X \cap \text{rad } Y$ . Furthermore, top filtration of a module  $Z$  is a filtration whose members are top submodules of  $Z$ .

PROPOSITION 1.  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is lean if and only if  $(C, \mathbf{e}_C)$  is a lean algebra and  $\text{Im } \gamma \subseteq (\text{rad } C)^2$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\text{Im } \gamma \subseteq (\text{rad } C)^2$  and  $(C, \mathbf{e}_C)$  be lean. We are going to show (2). The equality (2) is trivially true if  $i = 1$  or  $j = 1$ ; for, in this case  $m = 1$  and  $\varepsilon_1 = 1$ . Thus, let both  $i \geq 2, j \geq 2$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} e_i(\text{rad } A)^2 e_j &= e_i(\text{rad } A) \sum_{t=1}^n e_t(\text{rad } A) e_j = \\ &= \sum_{t \geq 2} e_i(\text{rad } A) e_t(\text{rad } A) e_j + e_i(\text{rad } A) e_1(\text{rad } A) e_j. \end{aligned}$$

The second summand  $e_i(\text{rad } A) e_1(\text{rad } A) e_j = e_i A e_1 A e_j$  satisfies

$$e_i A e_1 A e_j = e_i(e_i A e_1)(e_1 A e_j) e_j \subseteq e_i(\text{Im } \gamma) e_j \subseteq e_i(\text{rad } C)^2 e_j.$$

Moreover, the first summand can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t \geq 2} e_i(\text{rad } A) e_t(\text{rad } A) e_j = \\ &= \sum_{t \geq 2} e_i(\varepsilon_2(\text{rad } A) \varepsilon_2) e_t(\varepsilon_2(\text{rad } A) \varepsilon_2) e_j + \sum_{t \geq 2} e_i(\text{rad } C) e_t(\text{rad } C) e_j = e_i(\text{rad } C)^2 e_j. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, since  $C$  is lean and  $m = \min\{i, j\} \geq 2$ ,

$$e_i(\text{rad } C)^2 e_j = e_i(\text{rad } C) \varepsilon_m(\text{rad } C) e_j = e_i(\text{rad } A) \varepsilon_m(\text{rad } A) e_j,$$

as required.

Conversely, if  $A$  is lean, then  $C$  is obviously lean. Moreover

$$\text{Im } \gamma = (\varepsilon_2 A e_1)(e_1 A \varepsilon_2) \subseteq \varepsilon_2(\text{rad } A)e_1(\text{rad } A)\varepsilon_2 \subseteq \varepsilon_2(\text{rad } A)^2\varepsilon_2 = (\text{rad } C)^2.$$

The prof is completed.

Recall that the quasi-hereditary algebra  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is said to be *replete* if all  $V(i) = e_i A \varepsilon_{i+1} A$  are projective top submodules of  $\text{rad } P(i) = e_i(\text{rad } A)$ , and all  $V^o(i) = A \varepsilon_{i+1} A e_i$  are projective top submodules of  $\text{rad } P^o(i) = (\text{rad } A)e_i$  (see [ADL]). If  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is a replete quasi-hereditary algebra, then  $(C, \mathbf{e}_C)$  is a replete quasi-hereditary algebra and both  $S_C$  and  ${}_C T$  are projective  $C$ -modules. The following simple example shows that these conditions alone do not imply that  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is replete.

EXAMPLE 1.

Let  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  be the path algebra of the quiver  $2 \longrightarrow 1 \longrightarrow 3$ ; then  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is quasi-hereditary (in fact, hereditary); the regular representations are as follows:

$$A_A = \begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 3 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 3 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus 3, \quad {}_A A = \begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus 2 \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix}.$$

Here,  $(C, \mathbf{e}_C)$  is replete and both  $S_C$  and  ${}_C T$  are (simple) projective  $C$ -modules, but  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is not replete. Notice that  $e_2(\text{rad } A)^2 e_3 \neq 0$  and  $e_2(\text{rad } A)e_3(\text{rad } A)e_3 = 0$ . Indeed, the missing property is leanness.

PROPOSITION 2. *The algebra  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is a replete quasi-hereditary algebra if and only if  $(C, \mathbf{e}_C)$  is a replete quasi-hereditary algebra,  $S_C$  and  ${}_C T$  are projective  $C$ -modules and  $\text{Im } \gamma \subseteq (\text{rad } C)^2$ .*

*Proof.* If  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is replete (and thus lean), one can see immediately that  $(C, \mathbf{e}_C)$  is replete,  $S_C$  and  ${}_C T$  projective and, in view of Proposition 1,  $\text{Im } \gamma \subseteq (\text{rad } C)^2$ . Indeed, since  $V_A(i)$  is a top submodule of  $\text{rad } P_A(i)$ , for all  $i \geq 2$ ,  $V_C(i) = V_A(i)\varepsilon_2$  is a projective top submodule of  $\text{rad } P_C(i) = \text{rad } P_A(i)\varepsilon_2$ .

In order to prove that the conditions are sufficient, we need to show that  $V_A(i)$  is a projective top submodule of  $\text{rad } P_A(i)$  for  $1 \geq i \geq n$ . First, consider

$i \geq 2$ . Since  $V_C(i) = e_i(\text{rad } A)\varepsilon_{i+1}A\varepsilon_2$  is a projective top  $C$ -submodule of the  $C$ -module  $\text{rad } P_C(i) = e_i(\text{rad } A)\varepsilon_2$ ,  $V(i) = V_C(i) \otimes_C \varepsilon_2 A$  is a projective  $A$ -module.

Moreover, since by Proposition 1;  $A$  is lean, we have the equality

$$e_i(\text{rad } A)^2 e_{i+1} = e_i(\text{rad } A)\varepsilon_2(\text{rad } A)\varepsilon_{i+1},$$

and thus one can identify the top of  $V_A(i)$  in the top of  $\text{rad } P_A(i)$  with the top of  $V_C(i)$ . This yields a top embedding of  $V_A(i)$  in  $\text{rad } P_A(i)$ .

For  $i = 1$ ,  $V_A(1) = \text{rad } P_A(1) = S_C \otimes_C \varepsilon_2 A$  is a projective  $A$ -module since  $S_C$  is a projective  $C$ -module; furthermore,  $V_A(1)$  is obviously embedded in  $\text{rad } P_A(1)$  as a top submodule. One can use similar arguments to deal with the left  $A$ -modules  $V_A^o(i)$  which completes the proof.

Recall that the quasi-hereditary algebra  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is called *shallow* if all  $\text{rad } \Delta(i)$  and  $\text{rad } \Delta^o(i)$  are semi-simple,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . This is equivalent to the fact (see [ADL]) that

$$e_i(\text{rad } A)^2 e_j = e_i(\text{rad } A)\varepsilon_M(\text{rad } A)e_j \text{ for all } 1 \leq i, j \leq n, \quad M = \max\{i, j\}. \quad (3)$$

As a consequence, both  $\Delta_C$ -filtration of  $S_C$  and  $\Delta_C^o$ -filtration of  ${}_C T$  are in this case top filtrations (see [ADL]), and  $(C, \mathbf{e})$  is shallow. The above Example 1 shows that these properties are not sufficient for  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  to be shallow. In order to obtain a characterization of shallow algebras we need again to guarantee leanness of  $A$ .

**PROPOSITION 3.**  *$(A, \mathbf{e})$  is a shallow quasi-hereditary algebra if and only if  $(C, \mathbf{e}_C)$  is a shallow quasi-hereditary algebra,  $S_C$  has a top  $\Delta_C$ -filtration,  ${}_C T$  has a top  $\Delta_C^o$ -filtration and  $\text{Im } \gamma \subseteq (\text{rad } C)^2$ .*

*Proof.* We need only to show that the conditions for  $C$ ,  $S_C$ ,  ${}_C T$  and  $\gamma$  are sufficient to imply (3).

For  $i = j = 1$ , there is nothing to prove. If  $i = 1, j \geq 2$ , then the  $\Delta$ -filtration of  $\text{rad } P(1)$  induced by the top  $\Delta_C$ -filtration of  $S_C$  (which exists by [DR2]), is a

top filtration. Consequently,

$$e_1(\text{rad } A)^2 e_j \subseteq e_1(\text{rad } A) \varepsilon_j(\text{rad } A) e_j.$$

A similar argument works for  $i \geq 2, j = 1$ .

Hence, let  $i \geq 2, j \geq 2$ . Then, in view of the fact that  $(C, \mathbf{e}_C)$  is shallow,

$$e_i(\text{rad } A) \varepsilon_M(\text{rad } A) e_j = e_i(\text{rad } C) \varepsilon_M(\text{rad } C) e_j = e_i(\text{rad } C)^2 e_j,$$

which, in turn equals to  $e_i(\text{rad } A) \varepsilon_2(\text{rad } A) e_j$ . By Proposition 1,  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is lean, and thus, for  $m = \min\{i, j\}$ ,

$$e_i(\text{rad } A)^2 e_j = e_i(\text{rad } A) \varepsilon_m(\text{rad } A) e_j \subseteq e_i(\text{rad } A) \varepsilon_2(\text{rad } A) e_j,$$

as required.

The following two classes of lean algebras introduced in [ADL] (see also [D1]) fall in between the shallow and replete algebras. A quasi-hereditary algebra  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is called *right medial* if for every  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $V(i)$  is a top submodule of  $\text{rad } P(i)$  and both  $\text{rad } \Delta(i)$  and  $V(i)$  have top  $\Delta$ -filtrations. Equivalently,  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is right medial, if for every  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $V(i)$  is a top submodule of  $\text{rad } P(i)$  which has a top  $\Delta$ -filtration and  $V^o(i)$  is a projective top submodule of  $\text{rad } P^o(i)$ . The algebra  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is called *left medial* if its opposite  $(A^{op}, \mathbf{e})$  is right medial. Thus  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is left medial if, for every  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $\text{rad } \Delta(i)$  is semi-simple and  $V(i)$  is a projective top submodule of  $P(i)$  (see [ADL]). As a result, a characterization of right and left medial algebras, can be obtained by combining the conditions of Proposition 2 and 3.

**PROPOSITION 4.** *The algebra  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is a right medial quasi-hereditary algebra if and only if  $(C, \mathbf{e}_C)$  is a right medial quasi-hereditary algebra,  $S_C$  has a top  $\Delta_C$ -filtration,  ${}_C T$  is a projective  $C$ -module and  $\text{Im } \gamma \subseteq (\text{rad } C)^2$ .*

*Proof.* If  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is right medial, then for  $i \geq 2$ , both  $\text{rad } \Delta_C(i) = [\text{rad } \Delta_A(i)] \varepsilon_2$  and  $V_C(i) = V_A(i) \varepsilon_2$  have top  $\Delta_C$ -filtrations. Thus  $(C, \mathbf{e}_C)$  is right medial.



Moreover,  $S_C = V_A(1)\varepsilon_2$  has a top  $\Delta_C$ -filtration and  ${}_C T = \varepsilon_2 V_A^o(1)$  is projective. Finally, since  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is lean,  $\text{Im } \gamma \subseteq (\text{rad } C)^2$  by Proposition 1.

Conversely, if the conditions for  $C$ ,  $S_C$ ,  ${}_C T$  and  $\gamma$  are satisfied, the algebra  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is, by Proposition 1, a lean quasi-hereditary algebra. Thus, we can conclude that  $V(1) = S_C \otimes_C \varepsilon_2 A$  has a top  $\Delta$ -filtration and, for every  $i \geq 2$ ,  $V_A(i) = V_C(i) \otimes_C \varepsilon_2 A$  is a top submodule of  $\text{rad } P_A(i)$  with a top  $\Delta$ -filtration. Furthermore,  $V_A^o(1) = A\varepsilon_2 \otimes_C T$  is a projective top submodule of  $\text{rad } P_A^o(1)$  and, for every  $i \geq 2$ ,  $V_A^o(i) = A\varepsilon_2 \otimes V_C^o(i)$  is a projective top submodule of  $\text{rad } P_A^o(i)$ . Consequently,  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is right medial.

Using the definition of left medial algebras, we get immediately the following characterization.

**PROPOSITION 4<sup>op</sup>.** *The algebra  $(A, \mathbf{e})$  is a left medial quasi-hereditary algebra if and only if  $(C, \mathbf{e}_C)$  is a left medial quasi-hereditary algebra,  $S_C$  is a projective  $C$ -module,  ${}_C T$  has a top  $\Delta_C$ -filtration, and  $\text{Im } \gamma \subseteq (\text{rad } C)^2$ .*

The following example illustrates the situation.

**EXAMPLE 2.**

Let  $A$  be the path algebra whose regular representations are as follows:

$$A_A = \begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix} \begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} \begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix}, \quad {}_A A = \begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 3 \end{smallmatrix} \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} \begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} \oplus \begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix}.$$

Clearly,  $A$  is a right medial algebra which is not left medial. Here, the centralizer algebra is both right and left medial (in fact, shallow and replete),  $S_C$  has a top  $\Delta_C$ -filtration, while  $T_C$  is a projective  $C$ -module (with a top  $\Delta$ -filtration).

## REFERENCES

- [ADL1] Ágoston, I., Dlab, V., Lukács, E., Lean quasi-hereditary algebras, *Representations of Algebras. Sixth International Conference, Ottawa, 1992*. CMS Conference Proceedings **14**, 1–14.
- [D1] Dlab, V., Quasi-hereditary algebras, *Appendix to Drozd, Yu.A., Kirichenko, V.V., Finite dimensional algebras*. Springer-Verlag (1993.)

- [D2] Dlab, V., Quasi-hereditary algebras revisited, *An. St.Univ. Ovidius Constantza*, **4** (1996), 43-54.
- [DR1] Dlab, V., Ringel, C.M., Quasi-hereditary algebras, *Illinois J. of Math.* **35** (1989), 280–291.
- [DR2] Dlab, V., Ringel, C.M., A construction for quasi-hereditary algebras, *Compositio Math.* **70** (1989), 155–175.
- [MV] Mirollo, R., Vilonen, K., Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand reciprocity on perverse sheaves, *Ann.Scient.Ec.Norm.Sup.* **20** (1987), 311–324.
- [PS] Parshall, B.J., Scott, L.L., Derived categories, quasi-hereditary algebras, and algebraic groups, *Proc. Ottawa–Moosonee Workshop*, Carleton–Ottawa Math. Lecture Note Series **3** (1988), 1–105.